

A Tighter Congressional Rein on the CIA Urged

By DAVID KRASLOW

Ami Herald-Los Angeles Times Wire

WASHINGTON — It "almost chills the marrow of a man to hear about" the clandestine activities of Central Intelligence Agency operatives, Sen. Richard Russell (D, Ga.) told the Senate in 1956.

Chilled marrow or not, any people feel Congress ought to hear a lot more about what the CIA and the rest of the government's vast intelligence apparatus is doing.

They feel Congress has done a dangerously inadequate job of auditing the agency that operates in "dark back alleys," as Secretary of State Dean Rusk once said it, all over the world.

It is an old argument that seems no closer to resolution today than it did a decade or more ago. But it has been revived in hearings before the House Rules Committee on bills sponsored by 20 congressmen to establish a joint Senate-House watchdog committee over the CIA.

CIA subcommittees have functioned in the House and Senate for years. But proponents of the joint committee say the present system is lax, cursory, and far too informal for overseeing such a vital part of the government.

They do not question the need for secrecy, but they insist that a joint committee, staffed by full-time professionals, and adhering to formal procedures, can do a much more effective job of supervision.

* * *

THEY POINT to the work of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which rides hard on the Atomic Energy Commission and has not yet

"... We are often the victim of secrecy for secrecy's sake. Things are done to us and in our name which we know nothing of."

—Rep. John V. Lindsay



LINDSAY

compromised any of its secrets.

But an agency that has jurisdiction over the back alleys — in the never-never land of spies, U2 flights, and mysterious coup d'etats — is, of course, a different animal than the AEC.

There is a basic problem in dealing with the highly sensitive and vexatious issue of congressional supervision of the CIA.

The CIA is so secret, and the work done by the present CIA subcommittees is so secret, that it is extremely difficult for outsiders to make an informed judgment on how effective an auditing job Congress is now doing.

These outsiders include the great majority in Congress. And that's the rub.

* * *

MANY of these outsiders in Congress read of alleged CIA blunders in Laos and Viet Nam and at the Bay of Pigs and wonder if Congress

shouldn't be doing something more about the CIA.

Some members of Congress are certain they should in order to fulfill their constitutional responsibility of overseeing the executive branch.

Last August, Rep. John V. Lindsay (R, N.Y.) told the House during a discussion of the CIA and other intelligence agencies:

".... We are often the

victim of secrecy for secrecy's sake. Things are done to us and in our name which we know nothing of."

Sen. Eugene McCarthy (D, Minn.), who has been sponsoring joint committee bills for some 10 years, told the Senate last year:


"... As espionage and counter-espionage have become more pervasive and their techniques more subtle, the need for secrecy has, if anything increased."

"Nevertheless, I do not think it right that the Congress, which has the constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense and to oversee the operation of the executive agencies which operate in this area, should be kept so largely ignorant of what is going on in the 'back alleys.'"

* * *

"... As espionage and counter-espionage have become more pervasive and their techniques more subtle, the need for secrecy, has if anything, increased."

—Sen. Eugene McCarthy



MCCARTHY

AND THIS year McCarthy wrote that the CIA "has taken on the character of an invisible government answering only to itself. The CIA must be made accountable for its activities, not only to the President but also to Congress through a responsible committee."

The McCartneys and the Lindsays obviously do not share the view expressed by Sen. Leverett Saltonstall (R, Mass.) in 1960, after a U2 was shot down over the Soviet Union.

"We might obtain information which I personally would rather not have," Saltonstall said in warning the Senate not to investigate the CIA too intensely.

It is probably an oversimplification to suggest that the explanation for the opposing viewpoints lies in the fact that the Russells and Saltonstalls are "in" while the McCartneys and Lindsays are "out."

The CIA, a large bureaucracy which spends great sums and has extraordinary authority, answers to very few members of Congress. Its budget and number of employees are secret.

Russell and Saltonstall are in that select group because of their membership on the CIA subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Russell is chairman and Saltonstall the ranking Republican member.

MORI/CDF